DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 248 154 SO 015 811

AUTHOR Schmidt, Peter
TITLE Peace Is Our Profession: Teaching Nonviolence in the Schools.
SPONS AGENCY National Endowment for the Humanities (NFAH), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 84
NOTE 24p.; Research also supported by the Joseph Klingenstein Foundation.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Civil Rights; Humanities Instruction; Human Resources; *Interdisciplinary Approach; Organizations (Groups); *Peace; Secondary Education; Teaching Methods; *United States History; *United States Literature
IDENTIFIERS Abolitionism; Gandhi (Mahatma); *Nonviolence; Pacifism; Quakers

ABSTRACT

Ways in which secondary level humanities teachers can incorporate information and materials on pacifism and nonviolent action into their existing courses are discussed. To improve their abilities to think creatively about how to change the world, students must learn about nonviolence and the strategies used by pacifists in the pursuit of their causes. For example, in U.S. history and American literature classes students can be exposed to the writings of William Penn, George Fox, and John Woolman and can learn about the Quakers' commitment to nonviolent principles. By reading works of and about the abolitionists of the 18th and 19th centuries, students can learn about the tactics used by Elihu Burritt, Sojourner Truth, and others as they worked to end slavery. In addition to the examples from previous centuries, recent U.S. history also teaches the discerning student how nonviolence may be successfully used in resistance to violence and oppression, e.g., the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's, the Peace Corps of the 1960's, and the American civil rights movement. A brief bibliography of relevant publications and a list of nonviolent organizations and resources are included in the appendices. (RM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED248154

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Peter Schmidt

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PEACE IS OUR PROFESSION:
TEACHING NONVIOLENCE IN THE SCHOOLS

Peter Schmidt
1984

Research supported by the National Endowment
for the Humanities and the Joseph Klingenstein Foundation.

SO 015 811

PEACE IS OUR PROFESSION:
TEACHING NONVIOLENCE IN THE SCHOOLS

One of the most exciting and vital ideas in the world today is virtually ignored as a topic of serious study in most American classrooms. I am referring to the long-lived philosophy of nonviolence and its relevance to a world that is darkened by oppression and conflict. What makes the neglect of this particular idea so disturbing is that several courses present opportunities to examine its essential features. Yet our lack of imagination too frequently narrows the focus of our inquiry into nonviolence to the accomplishments of people such as Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King, rather than the tactics which were employed in leading their respective struggles against British imperialism and American racial bigotry. In this essay, I will consider the subject of nonviolence as an appropriate concern for our schools, paying particular attention to ways in which teachers of the humanities may incorporate information and materials on this topic into their existing courses.

A few years ago Woody Allen remarked: "More than any other time in our history, mankind now faces a crossroads. One path leads to despair and utter hopelessness. The other, to total extinction. Let us pray we have the wisdom to choose correctly."[1] While these two roads to oblivion are indicative of the precarious choices that we often face in the nuclear age, I suggest that the path of nonviolence may present a more hopeful turning point for humanity. That is not to say that all we need to do is to adopt a pacifist philosophy. The theory and practice of nonviolence are not simple matters. Yet without giving these

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ideas a proper place in our classrooms, we weaken our students' abilities to think creatively about how to change the world.

Michael Nagler, a professor of Classics and Comparative Literature at the university of California at Berkeley, wrote: "What we most need to cross the gulf between our prevailing 'master idea' of conflict and a safer world view is a glimpse of the other bank -- a vision of the world without deadly rivalry. Next we need knowledge of the mechanisms by which we could realistically get there; and finally we need, of course, the will to break out of our technological deathrap."[2] Vision, knowledge, and will are certainly human capacities and each should be a distinctive legacy of the proper educational development of our children. But how do we enlarge the possibilities for students to contemplate a nonviolent world? What do we need to know about this unfamiliar territory? And how do we nurture the vital will that is needed to better our world?

As I have already suggested, the study of pacifism and nonviolent action has been something less than a focal point of most secondary school course offerings. Yet if we are serious about wishing to create the occasions for studying nonviolence, an appropriate starting point is in America's colonial history. William Penn's first letter to the Delaware Indians, written prior to his arrival in the New World, is indicative of the Quakers' commitment to nonviolent principles:

> "Now I could have you well observe, that I am very sensible of the unkindness and injustice that hath been too much exercised towards you by the people of these parts of the world, who sought themselves, and to make great advantages by you, rather than be examples of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

> justice and goodness unto you . . . But I am not such a man, as is well known in my own country; I have great love and regard towards you, and I desire to win and gain your love and friendship, by a kind, just, and peaceable life, and the people I send are of the same mind, and shall in all things behave themselves accordingly."[3]

Certainly the works of William Penn, as well as those of other Quakers such as George Fox and John Woolman, are appropriate for both U.S. History and American Literature courses. While students are frequently exposed to the writings of William Bradford, John Winthrop, and John Smith, they are less aware of the alternative way of thinking that Penn and other Quakers practiced. They truly lived by a vision of peaceful coexistence with the native American people. Although Pennsylvania was no longer pacifist in its Indian policies by 1750, the Quakers had established a tradition of nonviolence that seems to have worked for nearly 70 years. It not only maintained the peace between native Americans and native Europeans for two generations, it also created the means by which mutual respect was able to develop between these two diverse cultural groups.

How were the Quakers and the Delaware Indians able to accomplish this task? Why does it relate to the need for studying nonviolence? First, it is important to note that the Quakers pursued an Indian policy that was firmly based upon their respect for the Delawares as people. John Woolman expressed this commonly held belief in his Journal:

> "Love was the first motion, and thence arose a concern to spend some time with the Indians, that I might feel and understand their life and the spirit they live in, if haply I might receive some instruction from them, or they might be in any degree helped forward by my following the leadings of Truth among them."[4]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A second principle that both groups adhered to was the idea that rumors of potential conflict should be investigated by sending unarmed emissaries to inquire of each other concerning the actual situation. A diary from the period indicates one such development in 1688 when rumors circulated that 500 Indian warriors were preparing to attack an English settlement. A half dozen unarmed Quakers arrived at the place where the warriors were alleged to be gathering and found only the chief in his bed with women and children working around him.5 It was only when Thomas Penn abandoned these policies that conflict between the colony of Pennsylvania and the Delaware Indians broke out. However, an account by Jonathan Dymond, an English Quaker of the early 19th century, relates the tradition that Friends who refused to arm themselves or to retire to garrisons were left unharmed by the Indians.[6]

This social vision, as I understand it, also became the core of the abolitionist movement of the 18th and 19th centuries. When Elihu Burritt, a blacksmith who devoted much of his life to writing and lecturing on behalf of temperance, world peace, and abolitionism, wrote Thoughts and Things at Home and Abroad in 1854, he proposed mass nonviolence, rather than the individual actions of the Quakers and others such as Henry David Thoreau. As founder of the League of Universal Brotherhood, Burritt advocated opposition to slavery and promoted increased international understanding by encouraging American communities to establish "sister-city" relationships with their foreign counterparts in Europe and Asia. For Burritt, the struggle against slavery was

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

in point of fact linked to the ideals of cooperation and understanding among the world's diverse peoples.

Perhaps his most lasting contribution to humanity was the institution of one of the first international peace pledges, signed by more than 50,000 citizens of a dozen nations between 1846 and 1857, a period marked by the Mexican-American War and in Europe, the revolutions of 1848. The pledge stated:

> "Believing all war to be inconsistent with the spirit of Christianity, and destructive to the best interests of mankind, I do hereby pledge myself never to enlist or enter into any army or navy, or to yield any voluntary support or sanction to the preparation or prosecution of any war, by whomsoever, for whatsoever proposed, declared, or waged. And I do hereby associate myself with all persons, of whatever country, condition, or color, who have signed . . . in a 'League of Universal Brotherhood'; whose object shall be to employ all legitimate and moral means for the abolition of all war, and all spirit, and all the manifestation of war, throughout the world; for the abolition of all restrictions upon international correspondence and friendly intercourse, and of whatever else tends to make enemies of nations, or prevents their fusion into one peaceful brotherhood."7

I selected this quotation from Burritt's peace pledge as it states both the case against war, as well as the positive philosophy of peaceful cooperation. In reading it, we should ask ourselves what was its basic goal? Why did people choose to sign it rather than conceding their individual consciences to the rallying cries of war in Europe and in the Americas? While the names of Generals Winfield Scott and Zachary Taylor are prominent in our American history textbooks, what do we know about peacemakers such as Burritt, Sarah and Angelina Grimké, and Adin Ballou? Each of these people consistently maintained that those who wanted to end slavery through violence would abdicate the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

moral high ground of the nonviolent abolitionists. It was Ballou who argued all too prophetically:

> "If the slaves are freed by rebellion, what is to be done with them for the next hundred years? How are they to be employed, trained for liberty and organized into well ordered communities? And above all, how is this work to be accomplished with the great mass of the whites in the country full of horror, loathing and revenge toward them?"[8]

This sense of anticipation, a quest for solutions before problems presented themselves, marked the philosophies and actions of the nonviolent antislavery movement. It was only natural that many of the same people advocated civil disobedience and nonviolent resistance as champions of the cause of women's equality. In words that echoed the sentiments of Elihu Burritt's call for universal brotherhood, Margaret Fuller, a social activist and scholarly associate of Ralph Waldo Emerson, wrote in Women in the Nineteenth Century:

> "We would have every arbitrary barrier thrown down. We would have every path laid open to Woman as freely as to Man. Were this done, and a slight temporary fermentation allowed to subside, we should see crystallizations more pure and of more various beauty. We believe the divine energy would pervade nature to a degree unknown in the history of former ages, and that no discordant collision, but a ravishing harmony of the spheres, would ensue."[9]

In the 19th century, the vision and practice of nonviolence effected pervasive changes in the social fabric of the United States and Europe. These examples of the distinctive faith in human reason in periods of crisis and conflict are indicative of pacifism in action. Clearly, the vision of a just society illuminated the ideals of people such as William Penn, Elihu Burritt, and Margaret Fuller. However, the quest for human dignity that

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

governed the lives of each of these great reformers was perhaps best understood by the victims of oppression and violence who, in turn, fought peacefully for freedom and equality.

Sojourner Truth, a former slave and a guiding light for the cause of nonviolent resistance to slavery and women's oppression, worked in Washington, D.C. following the Civil War as a minister to the needs of a newly freed black community. When Congress passed a bill in 1865 prohibiting segregation on the District's horsecar lines, Sojourner Truth took to the streets to make certain that the new laws were properly respected by white drivers. One morning, after being ignored by several cars that she attempted to flag down, her angry shouts drew a crowd until a car finally stopped. Vincent Harding, a Black historian at the Iliff School of Theology in Denver, described what followed in this poignant passage from <u>There Is A River</u>:

> "Then, when Sojourner Truth got on and took her seat with the other passengers, the conductor told her that either she would ride outside on the front platform directly behind the horses, or he would throw her off. Probably the man did not know to whom he was talking and the powerful Truth remained firmly in her seat. Indeed, to make her point, she stayed on beyond her stop. Finally, she left the car and joyfully said, 'Bless God. I have had a ride.' In addition, later she had the conductor arrested, caused him to lose his job, and did much to establish the right of blacks to ride all the horsecars in the nation's capital. It was, to be sure, quite a ride."[10]

By her direct action, Sojourner Truth contributed as much to the ideals of a free and democratic society as any of the Founding Fathers. Yet, how much attention do we give in our classrooms to such a passionate believer in justice and equality for all? Are we willing to recognize that "the true foundation

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of a republican government is the equal right of every citizen," as proposed by Thomas Jefferson?[11] So simple, and yet so grand a vision, is not the province of one person or one group, but the responsibility of us all. Sojourner Truth, quietly, but eloquently, understood that reality. Her form of resistance both challenged and denied the authority of white racists over her life and the aspirations of her people. Her actions were designed to demonstrate unequivocally her will to resist oppression and to assert her right to a better future.

In presenting the ideas of Sojourner Truth and other advocates of nonviolence to our students, we take action as responsible educators who understand that it is of crucial importance to enlarge the imaginations of youngsters and to expand their insights into the fullness of human reality. The relation between imagination and insight reminds me of something that Thoreau wrote in Walden. In describing the limits of technology, he said: "To make a railroad round the world available to all mankind, is equivalent to grading the whole surface of the planet. Men have an indistinct notion that if they keep up this activity of joint stocks and spades long enough all will at length ride . . . but through a crowd rushes to the depot . . . when the smoke is blown away and the vapor condensed, it will be perceived that a few are riding, but the rest are run over . . ."[12]

We have, it seems, an extraordinary occasion to nurture imagination and insight in the study of nonviolence. In addition to the examples from previous centuries, our recent history also teaches the discerning student how nonviolence may be success-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

fully used in resistance to violence and oppression. In 1910, when William James articulated his idea that virtues such as discipline, service, sacrifice, and camaraderie -- all matters of right conduct espoused by the military -- should be encouraged through voluntary associations toward more constructive ends such as conservation, education, and the elimination of poverty and hunger, he unknowingly contemplated the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's and the Peace Corps of the 1960's. He also advanced the idea that nonviolence could serve as the foundation of a secure society -- provided society was willing to take the risks demanded by a peaceable ethos. His thoughts on "The Moral Equivalent of War" have been described as "the most influential statement in the history of American nonviolence, next to Thoreau's essay on civil disobedience,"[13] and are pertinent today in our quest for a more secure planet:

> "Men now are proud of belonging to a conquering nation, and without a murmur they lay down their persons and their wealth, if by so doing they may fend off subjection. But who can be sure that other aspects of one's country may not, with time and education and suggestion enough, come to be regarded with similarly effective feelings of pride and shame? It is only a question of blowing on the spark till the whole population gets incandescent, and on the ruins of the old morals of military honour, a stable system of morals of civic honour builds itself up. What the whole community comes to believe in grasps the individual as in a vise. The war-function has graspt us so far; but constructive interests may some day seem no less imperative, and impose on the individual a hardly lighter burden."[14]

The strength of "The Moral Equivalent of War" was its insistence on an alternative to humanity's willful destruction of one another during warfare, and its thoughtless defilement of the environment. James and others, including Roger Baldwin, Alice

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Paul, and Jane Addams, challenged conventional thinking that war was simply an outgrowth of human nature, by affirming nonviolence as a basis for a secure and just society. Naturally, the difficulty of popularizing this task was intensified by America's entry into World War One, a conflict during which hundreds of American conscientious objectors were sentenced to lengthy prison terms and other opponents of the war were harassed and persecuted as "anti-Americans." Jane Addams described some of the difficult questions which pacifists asked themselves during these years in Peace and Bread in Time of War:

> "What after all, has maintained the human race on this old globe despite all the calamities of nature and all the tragic failings of mankind, if not faith in new possibilities, and courage to advocate them? Doubtless many times these new possibilities were declared by a man who, quite unconscious of his courage, bore the 'sense of being an exile,' a condemned criminal, a fugitive from mankind.' Did every one so feel who, in order to travel on his own proper path had been obliged to leave the traditional highway?"[15]

American pacifism and the belief in nonviolent social change came of age in the 1920s and 1930s as they were subjected to the acid tests of world war and, in the United States, the ongoing struggles for civil and social rights for blacks and women. During this time, two key works were published that became a wellspring of inspiration to pacifists in the decades between the two world wars. Sparked by a desire to educate Americans about the practical necessity of a nonviolent ethos, Devere Allen wrote The Fight for Peace in 1930 and four years later, Richard Gregg, an American disciple of Gandhi's, published The Power of Nonviolence. Calling for an active nonviolence in a war torn world, Allen and Gregg represented the same line of thinking that had

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

been articulated by William James: the only sure ground for sustained international peace and good relations among nations was a new world order, built upon freedom, justice, tolerance, and respect for one another. According to Gregg, this new order enlarged the meaning and practice of pacifism:

> "War is an important and necessary institution of our present civilization. War is not just an ugly excrescence, or a superficial illness, or occasional maladjustment, or temporary personal mistake of a few leaders of an otherwise fair and healthy society; war is an inherent, inevitable, essential element of the kind of civilization in which we live . . . War is of the very tissue of our civilization, and the only way to do away with it is to change, nonviolently and deeply, the motives, functions and structures of our civilization . . . We must alter many habits and change many routines and expectancies. We cannot eliminate all conflicts, but we can reduce their number and use nonviolent methods of settling them before they reach a violent stage. Our present order produces war. We must make a new civilization. This is a task to stir men's imaginations and energies."[16]

At no time in previous history had the awareness of nonviolence been as great. Aroused by the wanton violence of World War One, and educated by Gandhi's application of mass nonviolence and civil disobedience in India's fight for independence from Britain, a growing number of pacifists believed that a nonviolent international order was possible. During these years, several explicit characteristics of nonviolence emerged as advocates of peaceful social change recognized the need for eliminating physical violence, such as killings and starvation, as well as the more subtle institutional violence, such as discrimination and economic exploitation. Two converts to the philosophy of nonviolence, Dorothy Day and A. J. Muste, shared Gregg's commitment to remake civilization. Day, who founded the Catholic Worker move-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ment in 1933 with Peter Maurin, and Muste, a national leader of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, stirred the souls of all who would listen by preaching that violence permeated society not only during warfare, but through poverty, injustice, and deprivation as well. Both believed that the breeding grounds of war were ultimately the social and economic injustices present in most societies. For Muste, any effort to promote world peace demanded a new political orientation that started from that central reality.

"We are not engaged," Muste has written, "in seeking power, in taking over the institutions and the instruments of power, not even in order to use them for our own supposedly noble ends. We are truly committed to organizing life on the basis of love and not power . . . It is a new kind of society, not a change of government that we seek."[17]

A. J. Muste, Dorothy Day, and Richard Gregg are certainly not household names in America today. Yet their contributions to a better society, their firm beliefs in humanity, and their unshakeable convictions that the world could achieve lasting peace through the theory and practice of nonviolence, deeply influenced the thinking of Martin Luther King and other leaders of the early civil rights movement in America. Thus when Rosa Parks, a black seamstress, refused to give up her seat on a crowded bus to a white person, as required by law in Montgomery, Alabama, in 1955, she at once rekindled the tradition of Sojourner Truth, brightened the course followed by Muste, Day, and Gregg, and blazed a path for Martin Luther King.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Montgomery bus boycott that followed Rosa Parks' arrest on December 1, 1955, is perhaps the best-known example of mass nonviolence in American history. The goal was modest: to bring a genuine sense of community to Montgomery through the elimination of some barriers to integration. However, as Martin Luther King wrote in Stride Towards Freedom, Montgomery became a classroom in the study and application of nonviolent resistance to injustice:

> "When the protest began, my mind, consciously or unconsciously, was driven back to the Sermon on the Mount with its sublime teachings on love, and the Gandhian method of nonviolent resistance. As the days unfolded, I came to see the power of nonviolence more and more. Living through the actual experience of the protest, nonviolence became more than a method to which I gave intellectual assent; it became a commitment to a way of life. Many of the things that I had not cleared up intellectually concerning nonviolence were now solved in the sphere of practical action."[18]

While Dr. King is remembered primarily for his outstanding leadership of mass protests and civil disobedience actions such as the Montgomery bus boycott, I must emphasize that he gained international recognition as the youngest recipient of a Nobel Peace prize for his commitment to nonviolent social change. In following the path of Jesus' teaching in the Sermon on the Mount, and implementing the ideals of non-cooperation that Gandhi used in leading India to its independence, King understood the goal of his work as the creation of a more loving society. He wrote:

> "At the center of nonviolence stands the principle of love. The nonviolent resister would contend that in the struggle for human dignity, the oppressed people of the world must not succumb to the temptation of becoming bitter or indulging in hate campaigns. To retaliate in kind would do nothing but intensify the existence of hate in the universe. Along the way of life, someone must cut off the chain of hate. This can only be done by projecting the ethic of love to the center of our lives."[19]

Though my focus throughout this essay has been on American history, I must say a few words about the contributions of Mahatma Gandhi to the world's understanding of nonviolent resistance to oppression and injustice. Until Richard Attenborough's film "Gandhi" was released a few years ago, most Americans knew little of the life of this man who changed the people of India and Great Britain. While the film presented only the adult portion of Gandhi's life -- it left out the years of adolescence and early adulthood during which Gandhi wished to emulate British colonialists -- Attenborough captured Gandhi's intense commitment to overcoming violence through nonviolent action. Following the Amritsar Massacre in 1919, in which the British slaughtered 400 unarmed Indians and wounded 1500 others whom they denied medical attention, India was certainly ripe for violent retribution.

Yet, as the film carefully documents, Gandhi chose to pursue the ideal of nonviolent non-cooperation as the only way possible to break the grim cycle of violence that held India and the British captive. Thus Gandhi's greatest contribution to the people of India and to the world is his principled faith that nonviolence will work when faced with violence. At precisely the moment when logic would have dictated a violent response to British barbarism, Gandhi called for the opposite action. As Joan Bondurant wrote in Conquest of Violence, one of the outstanding works on Gandhian philosophy and techniques:

> "Perhaps the most persistent element in Gandhi is the recurring theme that non-violence is truth-creating . . . By non-violence Gandhi means, as we have seen, the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

> technique of conducting social relations characterized by constructive, peaceful attitudes, and infused with the determination to enlarge areas of agreement and to achieve resolution of conflict by persuasion . . . Truth is inseparable from non-violence, and the method of achieving and clinging to the truth is non-violence . . . The satyagrahi (followers of the Truth) . . . seeks a victory, not over the opponent, but over the situation in the best . . . synthesis possible."[20]

This is a powerful message. The fact that Gandhi and King demonstrated that it is possible to break out of an escalating spiral of violence is worthy of our attention in the classroom. However, the skeptics will say that it is impossible to apply nonviolent techniques to our present international situation, that the use of nonviolence is limited to isolated episodes in history. Therefore, why waste the time studying something that is no longer relevant, they will state disapprovingly.

I believe that education must promote an awareness of nonviolent social change such as I have described in this essay. I also suggest that a well-planned study of nonviolence may lead students toward action in their own lives, provided that we challenge them to become more aware of themselves, of their neighbors, and of the lives of people throughout the world. In Exploring Nonviolent Alternatives, Gene Sharp presents five areas of research into different nonviolent techniques and their consequences, as well as 85 cases of nonviolent action.[21] What is particularly revealing about Sharp's cases is the disparate circumstances during which nonviolent action was successfully used. "In light of the severity of the problems posed by contemporary violence," said Sharp, "this is a possible alternative which we dare not ignore."[22]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In our efforts to educate students about and for nonviolent social change, there is no specific starting point. However, I would suggest that we begin by taking two actions: first, each of us should analyze the courses that he or she is presently teaching in order to determine when and how descriptions and case studies of nonviolence could be integrated into the existing curriculum. Simultaneously, we should seek opportunities to educate ourselves about the theories, dynamics, and strategies for nonviolent action. I have included a bibliography and a listing of organizations in the nonviolent movement as guides to getting started with this work.

But the most complicated task will be the creation and promotion of a vision of a future built upon nonviolent cooperation among the world's peoples. Here, we must draw on our knowledge of American history by comparing our present situation to the early 19th century, when the abolition of slavery must have appeared as an insurmountable task to most people. Yet, there were those who believed in a better world and possessed the imagination to act on their dream. In thinking of a world without war, in which nuclear weapons have been replaced by a universal ethic of nonviolence, we may be imagining a dream world. As far out of sight as these ideals may be at the present time, we must never forget an essential lesson of history: change is possible and is frequently a matter of human choice and action.

Is nonviolence a possible basis for the foreign policy of a major superpower like the United States? Nearly three decades ago, the American Friends Service Committee addressed exactly

that question in a remarkable little book called Speak Truth to Power. Its message is as pertinent and inspiring today as it was when it was first published in 1955. In their examination of nonviolence as a basis for American national security and foreign policy, the authors drew the following conclusion:

> "Thus we believe that while man's nature makes war possible, it does not make war inevitable. Under the inspiration of a great cause and with great leadership, human nature can be made adequate to achieve creative solutions to whatever problems confront it. Moreover, man's struggle to control himself has been marked by a continuing series of successes. In the course of history he has gradually learned how to live peacefully in larger and larger units, and consequently to push his savage qualities farther and farther away. His concept of community has grown from a narrow tribal basis to one which embraces half the world. It must now be pushed further, for in our age there can be no stopping short of global community. We will either find a way to replace savagery with law and government on this last frontier, or there will soon be no community left at all."[23]

In choosing this lengthy quotation, I discovered that all of the essential elements for real security are described here. With a great cause and great leadership, we can change ourselves and the world. The basic unit of our survival is nothing smaller than the planet itself. History has taught us that nations have settled differences using means other than warfare. History also has recorded that countries that once regarded one another as enemies, learned how to live and act as allies. Who would have dreamed just fifteen years ago that the United States and the Peoples Republic of China would have developed a close working relationship?

In conclusion, we must face the difficult questions of our age secure in the faith of our ideals. The authors of Speak

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Truth to Power stood by these words and I stand with them.

> "We have been and we continue to be opposed to all wars, but we are not among those who deny the reality of evil, or assume that peace is merely the absence of war. Rather, believing that peace-making in the nuclear age has become not only the central but the most complex issue for mankind, we are constrained to make peace. Mankind, we believe, has a higher destiny than self-destruction."[24]

FOOTNOTES -- PEACE IS OUR PROFESSION

1. Daniel Ford, Henry Kendall, and Steven Nadis, Beyond the Freeze (Boston: Beacon Press, 1982), p. 16.

2. Michael Nagler, America Without Violence (Covelo, CA: Island Press, 1982), p. 117.

3. William Penn's "First Letter to the Delaware Indians," in Staughton Lynd, Nonviolence in America: A Documentary History (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1966), p. 4.

4. Robert Cooney and Helen Michalowski, The Power of the People (Culver City, CA: The Peace Press, 1977), p. 21.

5. Ibid., p. 21.

6. Staughton Lynd, Nonviolence in America: A Documentary History, "Introduction," p. xxi.

7. Robert Cooney and Helen Michalowski, The Power of the People, pp. 26-27.

8. Ibid., p. 31.

9. Margaret Fuller, Woman in the Nineteenth Century an excerpt in Sources of the American Republic by Marvin Meyer, John Cawelti, and Alexander Kern, (Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman, 1967), p. 456.

10. Vincent Harding, There is a River (New York: Vintage Books, 1983), p. 292.

11. Marvin Meyers, John Cawelti, and Alexander Kern, Sources of the American Republic, p. 274.

12. Henry David Thoreau, Walden and Other Writings, (New York: Bantam Books, 1962), p. 111.

13. Staughton Lynd, Nonviolence in America: A Documentary History, p. 134.

14. Ibid., p. 146.

15. Ibid., p. 189.

16. Richard Gregg, A Pacifist Program in Time of War, Threatened War, or Fascism (Wallingford, PA: Perdle Hill, 1939) p. 2.

17. Nat Hentoff, Peace Agitator: The Life of A. J. Muste (New York: Muste Peace Institute, 1982), pp. 231-232.

18. Martin Luther King, Stride Toward Freedom: The Montgomery Story (New York: Harper & Row, 1958), pp. 90-107.

19. Ibid., 90-107.

20. Joan Bondurant, Conquest of Violence (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1958), pp. 193-195.

21. Gene Sharp, Exploring Nonviolent Alternatives (Boston: Porter Sargent, 1970), pp. 115-123.

22. Ibid., p. 27.

23. American Friends Service Committee, Speak Truth to Power (Philadelphia: AFSC, 1955), pp. 52-53.

24. Ibid., p. 67.

APPENDIX B

List of Nonviolent Organizations and Resources

American Friends Service Committee (AFSC), 1501 Cherry Street, Philadelphia, PA 19102, 215-241-7177.

AFSC works to promote nonviolent action for social change. In addition to the central office in Philadelphia, there are local offices in most major cities.

Fellowship of Reconciliation (FOR), Box 271, Nyack, NY 10960, 914-358-4601.

FOR is a pacifist organization committed to nonviolent social change. It is actively involved in campaigns for disarmament and social justice.

Institute for World Order. (now World Policy Institute), 777 UN Plaza, New York, NY 10017, 212-490-0010.

Produces several invaluable resources on disarmament and alternative security systems, and world government.

Mobilization for Survival, 3601 Locust Walk, Philadelphia, PA 19104, 215-386-4875.

Mobilization is a coalition of social action groups that emphasize grassroots activities toward the goals of "zero nuclear weapons, no nuclear power, stopping the arms race and funding human needs."

Riverside Church Disarmament Program, 490 Riverside Drive, New York, NY 10027, 212-749-7000.

Provides speakers and resources on nonviolence and disarmament education for schools, church groups, and community organizations.

Sojourners, 1309 L Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20005, 202-737-2780.

Publishes a packet, "The Nuclear Challenge to Christian Conscience: A Study Guide for Churches," and offers other resources to church groups who are attempting to make disarmament issues central to the life of the church.

War Resisters League (WRL), 330 Lafayette Street, New York, NY 10012, 212-228-0450.

A pacifist organization whose members oppose armaments, conscription, and war.

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF), 1213 Race Street, Philadelphia, PA 19107, 215-563-7110.

WILPF emphasizes nonviolent solutions to domestic and international problems.

Women's Strike for Peace (WSP), 145 South 13th Street, Philadelphia, PA 19107, 215-923-0861.

WSP is an organization composed of women dedicated to achieving international disarmament under effective controls. They also work to ban all nuclear testing.

World Peacemakers, 2852 Ontario Road, N.W., Washington, DC 20009, 202-265-7582.

A mission group of the Church of the Savior that seeks to establish local groups both in their own churches as well as in other denominations.